DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 400 767 HE 029 616

TITLE	Faculty Roles and Responsibilities: Collecting and Reporting Statewide Information on Faculty.
INSTITUTION	Illinois State Board of Higher Education, Springfield.
PUB DATE	4 Sep 96
NOTE	9p.; For a related document, see ED 390 348.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; Data Analysis; Database Design; *Data Collection; Faculty Mobility; *Faculty Workload; Higher Education; Information Needs; State Boards of Education; State Programs; Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Responsibility; *Teacher Role; *Teacher Student Relationship
IDENTIFIERS	Illinois; *Illinois State Board of Higher Education

ABSTRACT

As part of its Priorities, Quality, and Productivity (PQP) initiative, the Illinois State Board of Higher Education asked institutions to address issues associated with faculty roles and responsibilities. This paper describes the statewide information collected, how the data are used in Board reports, and how improved data collection might strengthen analysis and PQP efforts. The paper also examines several major issues concerning faculty workload, faculty turnover, and faculty/student contact, and considers the kind of information needed to better understand, monitor, and facilitate progress in those areas. The paper reports that most of the information is collected annually by three main data systems: the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, the Faculty Credit Hour Survey, and the Resource Allocation Management Program. It also notes that a statewide data base on faculty is administered by the Illinois Community College Board. The paper suggests a two-step consultative process and timetable for developing statewide information on faculty: first, staff and academic officers of higher education institutions will review ways to improve data systems and expand data collection; and, second, a staff committee will consider technical issues connected with any changes to ensure smooth and efficient operations. (MAH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 400 767

Item #5B
September 4, 1996

STATE OF ILLINOIS
BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

FACULTY ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: COLLECTING AND REPORTING STATEWIDE INFORMATION ON FACULTY

HE 029 616

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Illinois State
Board of H.E.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Item #5B
September 4, 1996

STATE OF ILLINOIS
BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

FACULTY ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: COLLECTING AND REPORTING STATEWIDE INFORMATION ON FACULTY

As part of its Priorities, Quality, and Productivity (P•Q•P) initiative, the Board of Higher Education has asked institutions to address issues associated with faculty roles and responsibilities. This request reflects the conviction that faculty work defines and shapes higher education, and that the explicit and implicit priorities of faculty have fundamental importance for quality and productivity. To date, the Board has published papers, sponsored three statewide conferences, initiated planning, and worked with the Faculty Advisory Committee in addressing this topic.

The Board's faculty initiative has stressed "enhancing faculty contributions to institutional missions." This is intended to suggest that faculty time and effort should be allocated among instructional, public service and research responsibilities in a manner appropriate and supportive of an institution's mission, and that fundamental policies affecting faculty such as hiring, promotion, and tenure, as well as faculty development efforts, should act in harmony with institutional goals and plans. The Board's faculty initiative is intended to facilitate institutions' implementation of P•Q•P improvements, while also building upon ongoing efforts to strengthen undergraduate education and faculty involvement in teaching and undergraduate instruction.

The Board has asked staff to review current information systems and information needs as part of its faculty initiative. The following report describes the statewide information currently collected on faculty and indicates how this information is used in Board reports and how improved data collection might strengthen analysis and P•Q•P efforts. The report also examines a few major issues that have arisen in recent years concerning faculty workload, faculty turnover, and faculty/student contact and considers the kind of information that is needed to better understand, monitor, and facilitate progress in these areas.

Board staff plans to continue this review of faculty information in close collaboration with higher education institutions. Staff will follow a two-tier consultative process under which the academic officers will help identify general informational requirements--that is, the information that would be most useful for examining workload, turnover, and other questions--while a representative subcommittee with appropriate expertise will convene to address technical questions. Once this process is complete, staff will report to the Board on the results and the expected uses of the information.

Current Statewide Data on Faculty

The focus of this report is the information and data about faculty that the Board of Higher Education collects and uses for analysis. As described below, most of this information is collected annually by three main data systems: the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), the Faculty Credit Hour Survey, and the Resource Allocation Management Program (RAMP). The Faculty Credit Hour and the IPEDS surveys focus directly on faculty, while RAMP includes additional information. Also, IPEDS collects information from institutions in all three higher education sectors, while the Faculty Credit Hour Survey and RAMP collect information only from public universities. Together, over many years, these surveys have provided Illinois higher education with its basic information about faculty. More recently, the Board also has collected information about faculty on

an ad hoc basis to address specific needs and new initiatives. A brief description follows of current data collection and reporting activities.

Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). The Board of Higher Education manages two IPEDS surveys that contain information on faculty and that are administered on behalf of the National Center for Education Statistics. Distributed every other fall to all institutions of higher education, the *Fall Staff Survey* collects data on race and gender for all employees. Information on tenure, rank, and salary is also collected for full-time faculty. Much of this information is also collected through the IPEDS *Salaries, Tenure, and Fringe Benefits of Full-Time Instructional Faculty Survey*. The latter survey asks for the salaries of full-time faculty by gender, rank, and contract length. Information on benefits is collected for faculty with different contract lengths. Institutional staff complete this survey every year.

Using information from the two IPEDS surveys, the Board of Higher Education staff issues a biennial report on the status of employees in Illinois higher education. This report contains information on: 1) race and gender of employees in all occupational categories; 2) full-time and part-time status of employees by occupational category; 3) salaries for full-time employees; and 4) rank and tenure status for full-time faculty. The last Board report developed from these surveys was issued in July 1995, *Fall 1993 Employment in Illinois Higher Education*. The Board also uses this information in other selected reports such as the July 1996 report on *Staffing Trends in Illinois Higher Education* and the *Annual Report to the Governor and Legislature on Underrepresented Groups in Illinois Public Institutions of Higher Education*. Because the two surveys include similar information, the Board should explore the possibility of developing its own survey to ease the burden placed on institutions of collecting duplicative information. Under this procedure, Board staff would send to the federal government the appropriate information requested under IPEDS from this new survey.

Faculty Credit Hour Survey. The Faculty Credit Hour Survey is designed to show how faculty effort, as measured in staff years, is allocated to various departmental activities by academic discipline and level of instruction. These activities include direct instruction, indirect instruction, departmental research, and departmental administration. The survey allows comparison of credit hours per staff year across disciplines and institutions. Data are collected from each public university and summarized in the annual *Faculty Credit Hour Study for Illinois Public Universities*. The Board annually distributes the study, as well as a machine-readable version, to public universities for their internal use.

The Faculty Credit Hour Survey provides information for program review and Board analytical reports and activities. For example, in program review, staff use the study to determine how one institution differs from another in the way that faculty effort is assigned in a discipline to direct instruction, indirect instruction, departmental research and departmental administration. The study also provides information for special reports such as the July 1996, *Graduate Education in Illinois Higher Education: A Reexamination of Practice and Policy* which compares the allocation of faculty staff years between undergraduate and graduate education. In addition, the Board uses the Faculty Credit Hour Survey for benchmarking purposes in order to assist universities in the evaluation of faculty resources and contributions. The *Guidelines for Productivity Improvements in Illinois Higher Education* (March 1995), for example, offers information on faculty-student ratios across major disciplines. As discussed below, the Board and public universities could make greater analytical use of the Faculty Credit Hour Survey if the survey included more information on faculty activities and faculty composition, such as the distribution of faculty by full and part-time status and faculty rank.

Resource Allocation Management Program (RAMP). RAMP is a planning and budgeting mechanism for public universities and serves as the principal means for transmitting university planning and budget decisions to the Board of Higher Education. Each public university is required annually to provide to the Board of Higher Education budget tables which detail expenditures, as well

as staff years assigned to various functions including faculty and staff salaries. Budget tables from each public university are summarized and distributed in two volumes to university budget officers. These volumes aid institutional evaluations and provide the basis for staff analysis. Recent reports on staffing trends have helped to advance P•Q•P initiatives. For example, the Board's May 1995 *Update on Expenditure Trends in Illinois Higher Education* showed that expenditures for instruction have increased faster since 1992 than expenditures in research, public service, and support functions.

Public universities also submit through RAMP reviews of their academic programs on an eight-year cycle and requests for new academic programs. Through program reviews, the Board receives qualitative information about faculty work that is not available via other data collection efforts. For example, it is here where universities describe innovations in instructional technology, improvements in curricula, and faculty service to other departments and the community. Completing the review process aids universities in evaluating faculty contributions to university mission. Together, RAMP information addresses several questions which have implications for faculty roles and responsibilities. What does a university plan to accomplish over the next several years? How does the university plan to accomplish its goals? What resources are required to carry out the goals? In a separate process to be undertaken in the coming year, Board staff will review and revise the guidelines and criteria for program review and program approval as they pertain to faculty.

Campus Reports on Faculty Roles and Responsibilities. As part of the P•Q•P process, in 1995 the Board received reports from public institutions about their efforts to enhance faculty contributions. A Board report, *Faculty Roles and Responsibilities*, issued in November 1995, highlights information from these campus reports, particularly concerning faculty development, breadth of faculty contributions, and rewards and incentives. For 1996, the Board has requested public universities to include in their P•Q•P reports a description of how fundamental policies and procedures concerning faculty "are consistent with their institutional missions and advance institutional priorities identified in campus priority statements. Institutions should also report on how campus procedures ensure that all units can effectively implement campus-wide tenure, promotion, and salary policies." To date, the Board has not requested, as part of its faculty roles and responsibilities initiative, additional information about faculty for its annual IPEDS, Faculty Credit Hour Survey, and RAMP surveys.

Other Sources of Data. The Board periodically collects faculty information for special analytical studies and reports. For instance, in July 1996, the Board's *Employee Benefits for Illinois Public Higher Education and Staff* reported on retirement and disability benefits, group insurance, tuition waivers, and vacation and sick leave policies at public colleges and universities. This report offers a new perspective on employee compensation, one of the Board's highest priorities, by presenting data on the range of benefits available to higher education employees. The report should help institutions make decisions about resource allocations and achieve a proper balance in employee compensation between salary and enhanced vacation and sick leave payouts. The Board of Higher Education and public universities should consider collecting information on employee benefits on a regular basis.

The Board of Higher Education also produces reports from data collected by other agencies and surveys. The Board annually issues a report on faculty and civil service salaries from data collected by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). The AAUP publishes these data each year in the March-April issue of *Academe* and also in the past has made available a data disk to Board staff for more detailed analyses.

Another statewide data base on faculty is administered by the Illinois Community College Board which annually collects information from community colleges about part-time and full-time faculty. The ICCB surveys include information on: salary and fringe benefits, demographic status (including race/ethnicity and gender), academic credentials and employment history, length of service at current position and institution, and work assignments. The Illinois Community College Board publishes

information from these surveys in two annual reports, *Data and Characteristics of the Illinois Public Community College System* and *Salary Report for the Illinois Public Community Colleges*.

Issues

The information that the Board of Higher Education annually collects about faculty has changed very little over the years. As described above, the IPEDS and Faculty Credit Hour surveys are incomplete and unwieldy in a number of respects and survey modifications could yield better information. Rather than simply fine tune existing systems and processes, however, it may be more feasible and productive to design a new informational system that better integrates existing data and offers more detailed information. Since current data systems do not include adequate information about faculty to allow for a full examination of the Board's policy on undergraduate education and P•Q•P goals, in recent years the Board has collected information about faculty through special surveys or reports. While ad hoc data collection is often useful, such efforts lack the continuity necessary for trend analyses and ongoing examination. Described below are a few emerging issues that concern faculty, and whose informational needs should be considered as part of any redesign of statewide data systems.

Faculty Work. Discussion about faculty work, particularly in instruction, is often linked with issues of productivity and quality since faculty work produces not only credit hours but also student learning. Unhappily, there is sometimes a tendency to define instructional quality as the reverse side of productivity based upon the assumption that when productivity decreases through a lower student-faculty ratio, quality presumably increases. Such thinking presents quality and productivity as irreconcilable goals, and ignores the tremendous opportunity that institutions have to configure their staff and programs in support of student learning. The challenge that exists in developing data on faculty work is to ensure that the Board and institutions have information available that facilitates the advancement of Illinois higher education in its fullest sense, that is, that addresses matters of both productivity and quality.

Statewide data systems have limited information about faculty work. The Faculty Credit Hour Survey collects data on faculty staff-years by discipline and level at Illinois public universities. However, this survey does not collect information by faculty rank or full-time or part-time status, nor is information presented on types of instructional activities. While some of this information is collected through IPEDS, these data cannot be integrated with the Faculty Credit Hour Survey to produce workload information. In other words, information is not available on the credit hours produced by different types of faculty.

More information about faculty instructional activity by rank would permit analysis of a variety of current issues within Illinois higher education. For instance, one of the recommendations of the Board's Committee on Undergraduate Education was that "faculty assignments reflect the importance of undergraduate instruction by maintaining an appropriate balance between undergraduate instruction and graduate instruction, research, and public service. This balance should include the assignment of the institutions' most effective teachers to undergraduate courses, particularly lower-division courses." Collecting information by faculty rank would permit analysis of university efforts to implement this policy and enhance undergraduate education. It would also offer better information about the activities of non-tenured staff, such as teaching assistants and part-time instructors, as well as facilitate the development of more effective institutional strategies for the use of this staff.

The Faculty Credit Hour Survey does not distinguish among the various types of faculty credit activities, nor does it offer information about non-credit instructional duties (such as advising or course development). While it would be cumbersome and unrealistic to collect information on all faculty tasks, statewide data systems should offer a more complete picture of the multi-dimensional nature of faculty work. One way to begin this process would be to categorize various types of faculty

activity, for example, by allocating credit hours among lecture, laboratory and studio, seminar, and individual instructional assignments. Of course, other forms of categorization are possible and should be considered.

The above discussion has identified some information that might be collected to better understand the connections that exist between faculty work and institutional productivity and quality. Another important connecting point involves statewide and campus priorities. Since many major college or university initiatives affect faculty work, information on faculty activities and the composition of instructional staff is very relevant to the P•Q•P process. Data on the allocation of faculty work among various types of credit and noncredit activities, as well as other faculty behavior, may be critical to making an accurate assessment of P•Q•P efforts. For instance, in strengthening telecommunications or distance learning, an important priority at most institutions, changes in faculty work, such as the number of off-campus credit hours or total credit hours produced by faculty members, offer one means of measuring program effectiveness.

Faculty Turnover and Long-term Planning. The patterns of employment of college and university faculty are distinctive with faculty often remaining at a college or university for a long period of time, such as 20, 30, or even 40 years. Because of the longevity of faculty at many institutions, decisions to hire and grant tenure in many ways are more analogous to large scale capital investments than to annual operating expenditures. When the faculty as a whole is viewed as a long-term investment that can increase in value as it becomes better aligned with projected demands and more skilled in carrying out its assignments, the following kinds of questions are raised: What patterns of hiring across disciplines and faculty characteristics (for example, demographic, experience, expertise) need to be implemented to achieve long-term priorities and goals? What promotion and tenure rates support long-term goals? What leave rates, perhaps encouraged through retirement incentives, are needed to achieve long-term goals?

The data collected by the Board of Higher Education are not sufficient for long-term planning or addressing the kind of issues discussed above. At a minimum, such a statewide data base should incorporate information on the age of faculty and/or length of service, by discipline, data not currently available. Colleges and universities also should develop their own related information systems. Institutions should explore "what-if" questions that address various supply and demand scenarios, and develop analytical tools to support long-term faculty planning. The Board should also consider establishing reporting requirements that will guide institutions as they develop their information, and that will enable them to demonstrate how they have incorporated long-term faculty planning into P•Q•P processes.

The need for long-term planning is now especially acute since college and university faculty have a disproportionate number of members hired in the 1960s, when the capacity of higher education was dramatically expanded, and who now are approaching the age of retirement. The skewed age distribution of faculty presents a series of challenges. Perhaps most pressing, institutions will need to replace a significant portion of their senior faculty whose contributions and achievements are, in no small measure, responsible for the fine reputation of Illinois higher education. While hiring large numbers of quality faculty to replace existing staff is a formidable assignment, the retirement of unprecedented numbers of faculty also presents an unusual opportunity to rethink and reconfigure basic programs and operations. To offer one example of a situation likely to occur: many institutions have graduate programs in fields that only tangentially serve the campus' central mission, but are valued because they have a core of talented and productive faculty. A high degree of turnover among senior staff should place such a program in new light, bringing into sharper relief the connection between institutional and program objectives. With retirements across campus likely in many such programs, large-scale faculty turnover will present opportunities to undertake related initiatives that better articulate and strengthen institutional missions and priorities.

It is not possible to fully articulate the institutional changes that could be made during the coming years of high faculty turnover. Certainly, institutions will have opportunities to reconsider and adjust faculty composition (such as the balance between full and part-time faculty, tenure-track and nontenure-track faculty, and faculty by rank); improve gender and race/ethnic representation, reexamine the relationship and responsibilities of faculty and support staff (for example, in the area of advising); and study and modify faculty roles in instruction, public service, and research processes. Another area meriting special attention is telecommunications and computer use, particularly how institutions might build on faculty strengths, while also maximizing the significant capabilities of emerging technologies. This is an issue with major implications for the nature and structure of faculty work. If institutions are to fully capitalize upon these potentialities, they will need to develop comprehensive long-term plans to guide decision-making and implementation efforts.

In modifying and expanding its data bases on faculty, the Board of Higher Education should ensure that information will be available to facilitate institutional efforts to address the kinds of issues described above. At the same time, the Board should consider additional uses for this information. One major topic now before the Board is doctoral education. The appropriate capacity of doctoral programs in the state is an important issue involving an estimation of the number of Ph.D. recipients needed to meet future academic and nonacademic employment. Unfortunately, there are no current statewide data, or even relevant national information on this topic. A major national study on future faculty demand that William Bowen and Julie Sosa published in 1989 already has been shown to overestimate supply needs.

Faculty-Student Contact. The above discussion centers on P•Q•P and examines the kind of faculty information that would be useful in this context. There are, however, other questions and issues that have been raised concerning faculty, many of which come from students and their parents, as well as external constituencies, and which focus on accountability.

To a great extent, the information that students and their parents seek about faculty concern the frequency and quality of student/faculty contact. While some of the information about faculty work identified above also could be distributed to students and their parents, it should be recognized that data that are very powerful for analysis may be inadequate as an accountability tool. For instance, terms such as faculty staff years and units of analysis such as student credit hours per faculty staff year may not be easily understood, unless additional explanation is given. Students seek information about instructional responsibilities. Information about the number of full-time and part-time instructors, teaching assistants, and tenured faculty that teach undergraduate courses is most commonly sought, as well as information about class sizes and in-class and out-of-class interaction with faculty.

If possible, data collected for accountability purposes should include information about the quality of the education offered and the different types of student/faculty interaction that occur at colleges and universities. Collecting information about such learning opportunities can be difficult, and categorization of various types of student/faculty contact may be needed. However, information systems that cannot capture efforts to improve undergraduate education such as by providing students with E-Mail access to their professors, offering opportunities to undertake research with faculty, or increasing the number of low enrollment freshmen classes taught by tenure track faculty, must necessarily be used with caution and supplemented whenever possible with narrative explanation.

A Process and Timetable for Developing Statewide Information on Faculty

Since colleges and universities ultimately have the responsibility for collecting statewide information about faculty and since they will later use this information for analysis and support of P•Q•P improvements, it is important that these institutions have the opportunity to participate in efforts to review and develop new information systems on faculty. This consultative process should

be broadly conceived in order to reflect the wide range of institutional missions and faculty practices across the state, and to obtain diverse views on conceptual and technical matters.

Board staff proposes a two-step approach in this consultative process. First, staff will meet with academic officers of higher education institutions to review ways of improving or replacing existing data systems and to expand the collection of faculty information in order to better meet P•Q•P goals and enhance accountability. One of the outcomes of this review should be to improve data collection so that Illinois higher education can address more fully issues concerning faculty work, faculty turnover, and faculty-student contact. Second, staff should convene a committee to consider the technical issues that arise with changes in data systems and to ensure that implementation of new procedures and enhanced data collection occurs as smoothly and efficiently as possible.

Staff will report to the Illinois Board of Higher Education in November 1997 on measures that have been taken to modify and expand statewide information systems about faculty. The staff report will describe any expansion or modification of existing data systems, and/or development of new data systems. The report will also explain the types of new information that will be collected on faculty and how such information will be used to enhance the Board's P•Q•P initiative and to promote accountability for Illinois higher education.